

11-18-65

MINUTES
OF
MEETING OF STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
November 18, 1965

The regular monthly meeting of the State Highway Commission was held at the Central Highway Office in Richmond on November 18, 1965, at 10 A.M. The chairman, Mr. Douglas B. Fugate, presided.

Present: Messrs. Fugate, Baughen, Chilton, Fitzpatrick, Holland, Landrith, McWane, Sclater, and Weaver,

On motion of Mr. Chilton, seconded by Mr. Landrith, minutes of the meetings of October 27, 1965, and October 28, 1965, were approved.

Motion was made by Mr. Chilton, seconded by Mr. Landrith, that permits issued from October 28, 1965, to November 17, 1965, inclusive, as shown by records of the Department, be approved. Motion carried.

On motion of Mr. Chilton, seconded by Mr. Landrith, cancellation of permits from October 28, 1965, to November 17, 1965, inclusive, as shown by records of the Department, was approved.

11-18-65

Moved by Mr. Gilton Seconded by Mr. Holland,

that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of Section 128 of Title 23 - Highways, United States Code, a Public Hearing was held in the Spotsylvania County Courthouse, Spotsylvania, Virginia, at 2:00 p.m., on October 14, 1965, concerning the proposed construction of Route 17 from an intersection with Route 1 (south of Fredericksburg) to an intersection with Route 2 (at New Post), in Spotsylvania County, State Project 6017-088-101, Federal Project F-012-2() and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance and all those present were given a full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the proposed development as planned and their statements being duly recorded, and

WHEREAS, the economic effects of the proposed relocation have been examined and given proper consideration, and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the construction of this project be approved in accordance with the general plan as proposed and presented at the Public Hearing by the Department Engineers. This proposed improvement is on new location to the south of Fredericksburg.
Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Sclater, Seconded by Judge Weaver,

that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of Section 116 (c) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, a PUBLIC HEARING was held at the Cleveland Elementary School in Scott County on Friday, October 15, at 2:00 P.M. concerning the proposed construction and/or reconstruction of Route 614 from 0.364 mile east of the intersection of Route 639 to 0.317 mile west of intersection of Route 639, said project being mostly on new location and including a new underpass of the Southern Railroad, State Project 0614-084-113, C-501, B-609, Federal Project BC-647(4); and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance and all those present were given full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the construction as planned, their statements being duly recorded; and

WHEREAS, the economic effects of the location and the proposed improvements have been examined and given proper consideration and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the construction of this project is approved in accordance with the plans, following generally along a new location, as proposed and presented by the engineering division of the Department of Highways.
Motion carried.

11-18-65

Moved by Mr. Sciater, Seconded by Mr. Holland,
that

WHEREAS, Route 21 in Grayson County has been altered and reconstructed as shown on plans for Project 0021-038-001, C-501; and

WHEREAS, two sections of the old road are no longer necessary as a public road, the new road serving the same citizens as the old, and two sections of the old road are no longer necessary for purposes of the State Highway System, and two sections of the old road are to be transferred to the Secondary System;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 33-76.5 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, 0.19 mile of the old location of Route 21, shown in blue and designated as Sections 1 and 4 on the plat dated August 5, 1965, Project 0021-038-001, C-501, be abandoned as a part of the State Highway System;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 33-76.1 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, 0.23 mile of old location of Route 21, shown in yellow and designated as Sections 2 and 3 on the plat and project referred to hereinabove, be discontinued as a part of the State Highway System;

BE IT ALSO FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 33-27 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, 0.19 mile of the old location of Route 21, shown in red and designated as Sections 5 and 6 on the plat and project referred to hereinabove, be transferred from the Primary System to the Secondary System of Highways.
Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Landrith, Seconded by Mr. Baughan, that
WHEREAS, by proper resolutions, the Boards of Supervisors of several counties have requested that certain roads which no longer serve as a public necessity be discontinued as parts of the Secondary System of Highways;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 33-76.7 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, the following roads be discontinued as part of the Secondary System of Highways, effective this date.

AUGUSTA COUNTY

- Sections 4 and 7 of old location Route 608, between Station 93 + 80 and Station 122 + 60, Project 0608-007-116, C-501-----0.47 Mile

DICKENSON COUNTY

- Route 718, from 0.41 mile southwest of Route 80 to a dead end at a point 0.50 mile southwest of Route 80-----0.09 Mile

11-18-65

FAIRFAX COUNTY

- Section 1 of old location
Route 620, from Station 49
+ 50 to Station 57 + 75,
Project 0620-029-117, C-501---0.18 Mile

- Section 1 of old location
Route 612, from Prince William
County Line to Station 88 + 50,
Project 0612-029-103, C501----0.23 Mile

GILES COUNTY

- Sections 1, 3, 4 and 5 of old
location Routes 635 and 630,
between Station 43 + 00 and
Station 189 + 50, Project
0635-035-105, C501-----0.72 Mile

NELSON COUNTY

- Sections 6 and 8 of old location
Route 623, between Route 700
and Station 122 + 00, Project
0623-062-106, C501-----0.51 Mile

PAGE COUNTY

- Section 1 of old location Route
605, from 0.75 mile south Route
662, south 0.02 mile-----0.02 Mile

**RAPPAHANNOCK
COUNTY**

- Section 5 of old location
Route 618, from Station 159
+ 10 to Station 162 + 60,
Project 0618-078-105,
C-502-----0.08 Mile

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Fitzpatrick, Seconded by Mr. Landrith,
that

WHEREAS, under authority of Section 33-35.4 of the Code
of Virginia, 1950, as amended, request is made by the City of Falls
Church for payment at the rate of \$800 per mile annually on additional
street mileage meeting required standards for maintenance payments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that quarterly payments
at the rate of \$800 per mile annually be made to the City of Falls
Church on additional streets, totaling 2.56 miles and meeting standards
required by this section of the Code, effective beginning October 1,
1965, for the quarterly payment due after December 31, 1965. The
additional mileage eligible for payment, described as follows:

Abbott Lane	- From S. West Street to County Line	-0.068 MI.
Birch Street	- From W. Broad Street to 350' northeast	-0.104 MI.

Dorchester Road	-From Meridian Street east to end	- 0.034 Mi.
Gordon Road	-From W. Broad Street to WCL	- 0.146 Mi.
Jackson Court	-From Jackson Street to 190' east	- 0.031 Mi.
Marshall Street	-From Seaton Lane to 384' south	- 0.111 Mi.
Meridian Street	-From Lincoln Avenue to 300' north	- 0.057 Mi.
Maple Avenue	-From Park Avenue to Great Falls St.	- 0.107 Mi.
Maple Avenue	-From E. of Great Falls St. to W. Jefferson Street	- 0.170 Mi.
Noland Street	-From Midvale Street - northeast	- 0.084 Mi.
Poplar Drive	-From South of Gibson St. to Cul-de-sac	- 0.028 Mi.
Park Avenue	-From Little Falls St. to N. Washington Street	- 0.182 Mi.
Parker Avenue	-From South Spring St. to South Oak Street	- 0.136 Mi.
Roosevelt Blvd.	-From Wilson Blvd. to 1825' north	- 0.345 Mi.
N. Sycamore St.	-From N. Roosevelt St. to 350' north	- 0.066 Mi.
S. Maple Avenue	-From S. Washington St. to Timmers Hill	- 0.151 Mi.
N. Tuckahoe St.	-From N. Roosevelt St. to 488' north	- 0.092 Mi.
Timber Lane	-From S. Oak Street to Parker Avenue	- 0.085 Mi.
Tyson Drive	-From Buxton Road to 610' northeast	- 0.116 Mi.
W. Columbia St.	-From N. Washington St. to Maple Ave.	- 0.076 Mi.
Walden Court	-From Lincoln Avenue to Cul-de-sac	- 0.038 Mi.
N. Fairfax St.	-From Cherry Street to 450' west	- 0.084 Mi.
N. Roosevelt St.	-From E. Broad St. to 650' northeast	- 0.123 Mi.
Seaton Lane	-From S. Oak St. to Geo. Mason Road	- 0.062 Mi.

The above additions totaling 2.56 miles will increase the total mileage in the City of Falls Church from 23.52 to 26.08 miles of approved streets. Motion carried.

11-10-65

Moved by Mr. Fitzpatrick, Seconded by Mr. Landrich,
that

WHEREAS, under authority of Section 33-35.4 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, request is made by the City of Roanoke for payment at the rate of \$800 per mile annually on additional street mileage meeting required standards for maintenance payments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that quarterly payments at the rate of \$800 per mile annually be made to the City of Roanoke on additional streets, totaling 2.22 miles and meeting standards required by this section of the Code, effective beginning October 1, 1965, for the quarterly payment after December 31, 1965. The additional mileage eligible for payment, described as follows:

Fenarth Road	-From Route 220 to Canterbury Lane	- 0.16 Mi.
Fenarth Road	-From Canterbury Lane to Dead End	- 0.09 Mi.
Bramble Lane	-From Fenarth Road to Ridgewood Lane	- 0.12 Mi.
Canterbury Lane	-From Fenarth Road to Ridgewood Lane	- 0.13 Mi.
Ridgewood Lane	-From Canterbury Lane to Dead End	- 0.14 Mi.
Willow Oak Drive	-From Route 220 to 1943 Corp. Line	- 0.06 Mi.
Willow Oak Drive	-From 1943 Corp. Line to Dead End	- 0.06 Mi.
Shadblow Lane	-From Willow Oak Drive to Dead End	- 0.06 Mi.
Bosworth Drive	-From Corp. Limit Line to Dead End	- 0.42 Mi.
Darwin Road	-From 125' W. of Alton Road to Dead End	- 0.15 Mi.
Darwin Road	-From 125' W. of Alton Road to 1943 Corp. Line	- 0.16 Mi.
Alton Road	-From Darwin Road to Dead End	- 0.05 Mi.
Heatherton Road	-From Darwin Rd. Lane to Three Chop Lane	- 0.12 Mi.
Coventry Lane	-From Heatherton Road to Dead End	- 0.05 Mi.
Three Chop Lane	-From Darwin Road to Dead End	- 0.19 Mi.
Londonderry Drive	-From Three Chop Lane to Corp. Line	- 0.16 Mi.
Peakwood Drive	-Area Between 1943 Corp. Line	- 0.10 Mi.

The above additions totaling 2.22 miles will increase the total mileage in the City of Roanoke from 295.64 miles to 297.86 miles of approved streets.

Motion carried.

11-18-65

Moved by Mr. Fitzpatrick, Seconded by Mr. Landrith,
that

WHEREAS, under authority of Section 33-95.4 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, request is made by the Town of Vienna for payment at the base rate of \$800 per mile annually on additional street mileage meeting required standards for maintenance payments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that quarterly payments at the base rate of \$800 per mile annually be made to the Town of Vienna on additional streets, totaling 0.94 mile and meeting standards required by this section of the Code, effective beginning July 1, 1965, for the quarterly payment due after September 30, 1965. The additional mileage eligible for payment described as follows:

Sharon Lane	-From Lawyers Road to Cul-de-sac	- 0.05 Mi.
Westwood Drive	-From Old Court House Ed. to Overlook Lane	- 0.15 Mi.
Longview Court	-From Westwood Drive to Cul-de-sac	- 0.04 Mi.
Manor Drive	-From Westwood Drive to Country Club Drive	- 0.12 Mi.
Fairway Drive	-From Course Street to Overlook Lane	- 0.21 Mi.
Overlook Lane	-From Fairway Drive to Country Club Drive	- 0.10 Mi.
Country Club Dr.	-From Old Court House Ed. to Overlook Lane	- 0.20 Mi.
Skyline Court	-From Country Club Drive to Cul-de-sac	- 0.07 Mi.

The above additions totaling 0.94 mile increase the total mileage in the Town of Vienna from 45.61 miles to 46.55 miles of approved streets.
Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Baughan, Seconded by Judge Weaver,
that

WHEREAS, it is deemed necessary to provide an extension to State Route 257 between U. S. Route 11 in the Town of Mt. Crawford and the interchange of Interstate Route 81 in Rockingham County, the proposed extension to be made a part of the Primary System of Highways, and designated as State Route 257.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that under authority of Section 33-26 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, Secondary Route T-682 and a portion of Route 682 be transferred to the Primary System of Highways, beginning at the intersection with U. S. Route 11 in the Town of Mt. Crawford east to the end of ramps on the east side of the interchange of Interstate Route 81 in Rockingham County, a distance of approximately 0.5 mile and be designated as a part of State Route 257.
Motion carried.

11-18-43

Moved by Mr. Landrith Seconded by Judge Weaver,
that

WHEREAS, Section 46.1-193 and Section 46.1-345 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, provides for increasing or decreasing speed limits from the statutable established speed limits and/or establishing a minimum speed limit when such increase or decrease and/or establishment of a minimum speed limit has been prescribed by the State Highway Commission after an engineering and traffic investigation; and

WHEREAS, The Highway Department has now completed the required engineering and traffic investigation for the herein specified section or sections of highway and has determined that the respective maximum and/or minimum speed limit should be established accordingly and as affixed herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the speed limit for all vehicles not otherwise restricted by statute, be ascribed for the following specified section or sections of highway as shown on the attached tabulations by districts.

Motion carried.

Route	Location	Length (Miles)	Speed Limit (MPH)
<u>Primary System</u>			
BRISTOL DISTRICT			
<u>Scott County</u>			
23	Fr: Route 780 (M.P. 24.08) To: 0.03 Mi. N. of Routes 58-621 (M.P. 24.95)	0.87	45
SALEM DISTRICT			
<u>Rossake County</u>			
419	Fr: Route 221 (M.P. 6.32) To: ECL Salem (M.P. 9.56)	3.22	45
<u>Secondary System</u>			
RICHMOND DISTRICT			
<u>Henover County</u>			
626	Fr: Route 623 To: N. Int. Route 660	0.76	45
1108	Fr: Route 360 To: 0.33 Mi. W. of Route 360	0.33	35
<u>Prince George County</u>			
608	Fr: Flank Road To: Route 345	1.08	55/45

11-18-65

Moved by Mr. Slater, Seconded by Mr. Holland, that
WHEREAS, in connection with Route 460, Project 1913-04
in the Town of Grundy in Buchanan County, the Commonwealth did
acquire certain land and easements from George O. McGuire by
deed recorded in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court
of Buchanan County in Deed Book 127, Page 215; and,

WHEREAS, the adjoining lands of McGuire are now in
process of being graded to the same elevation as the roadway
so that the necessity for the said easement will no longer
exist; and,

WHEREAS, the said George O. McGuire has requested
that the said easement be extinguished and quitclaimed to him
in order to provide for the more orderly development of his
adjoining property; and,

WHEREAS, the State Highway Commissioner has certified
in writing that the said easement so acquired which lies between
approximate Station 19 + 97 and approximate Survey Station 22 + 19,
and north of the north fee simple right of way line of said Route
and Project, a line 25.5 feet north of and parallel to the survey
and plan centerline of same, does not constitute a section of the
public road and is deemed no longer necessary for the uses of
the State Highway System.

NOW, THEREFORE, conveyance of the said easement so
certified to the owner or owners of record of the adjoining and
underlying lands in accordance with the provisions of Section
33-75.6 of the 1950 Code of Virginia as amended is hereby approved,
and the State Highway Commissioner is hereby authorized to execute
a deed of quitclaim accordingly in exchange for a consideration
acceptable to the State Right of Way Engineer.
Motion carried.

11-18-65

Moved by Mr. Holland Seconded by Mr. Landrith,
that

WHEREAS, in connection with Interstate Route 64, Project 0064-121-101, NW-302, C-505, B-613 in the City of Newport News the Commonwealth did acquire all of the lands lying between said Interstate Route 64 and the northeast right of way line of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway in the vicinity of the existing grade crossing of Route 173; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth and the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company have entered into an agreement under date of July 24, 1963, which provides for the exchange of lands between them in this vicinity, whereby the Chesapeake and Ohio would convey to the Commonwealth those portions of its property needed to construct Route 64 and the Commonwealth would convey to the Chesapeake and Ohio any lands lying beyond and outside of its southwest limited access right of way line and adjacent to Chesapeake and Ohio's freight tracks; and

WHEREAS, the State Highway Commissioner has certified in writing that he deems the conveyance of that parcel of land lying southwest of the southwest limited access right of way line of said Route 64 and adjacent to the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway right of way from a point opposite approximate survey Station 1719 + 00 EBL to a point opposite approximate survey Station 1734 + 90 EBL in accordance with the aforesaid agreement to be in the public interest.

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of Section 33-117.4 of the 1950 Code of Virginia as amended, this Commission declares conveyance of such parcel of land to the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway to be in the public interest, and the State Highway Commissioner is hereby authorized to execute in the name of the Commonwealth a deed of quitclaim conveying same to the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem requisite.
Motion carried.

11-18-65

Before hearing representatives of the Virginia Nurserymen's Association, who had asked to appear before the Commission, Mr. Fugate stated that a few weeks ago the Landscape Division had asked for competitive bids on a rather sizable number of small plantings, shrubs, young trees, etc., estimated to cost about \$5,000 to \$6,000. This material was to be placed in three small nurseries which the Department has maintained at Bristol, Salem, and Suffolk, and possibly in nurseries to be set up at other district headquarters. He asked Mr. E. W. Turner, Landscape Engineer, to explain further.

Mr. Turner said the Department had been thinking in terms of economy and convenience in their plan to purchase a small number (44,000) plants for the eight districts, to be lined out and available when needed for replacements and for use in small plantings occasionally requested by the Resident Engineers, particularly for erosion control on slopes. He said a great deal of red tape and paper work could be saved by having these plants available.

Mr. Turner further stated that on new construction, plans are drawn up and the landscaping let to contract, that approximately \$2 Million of work per year is let to contract, approximately 50% of which has gone to Virginia nurserymen.

Mr. Landrith asked how much additional personnel would be required to take care of these nurseries. Mr. Turner stated there would be no additional personnel.

Mr. Sclater asked whether when roads are abandoned any nursery stock thereon is taken into the small nurseries to be used again. Mr. Turner replied that this is done.

Mr. Landrith asked how much the 44,000 plants would cost. Mr. Turner stated \$5,700 and that when grown they would be worth \$219,000.

Mr. Fugate stated that when the Landscape Division asked for bids it became known throughout the state and a number of nurserymen individually took exception to the proposition that we would buy small nursery stock and grow it for this purpose. He said: Mr. Carl Flemer, President of the Virginia Nurserymen's Association and Mr. Shoosmith, an officer of the Association, had come in with Delegate Walther Tidier and had discussed this at some length.

Mr. Fugate said this is not the first instance in which private industry had felt that the Highway Department was infringing on the prerogatives of private industry, that quarries had

11-18-65

objected to quarrying operations by prison labor, and there had been objection to printing done by the Department. He said there is always an area in which the line has to be drawn between legitimate activities by public agencies and private enterprise.

With this background, Mr. Fugate told Mr. Flemer that the Commission would be happy to hear him and his associates. Mr. Flemer introduced Mr. Sam Tankard, of the Eastern Shore; Mr. Wendell Winn, of Norfolk; Mr. Ray Quillen, of Waynesboro, and Mr. Bert Shoosmith, of the Southside nurseries; also Mr. Ray Brush of the American Nurserymen's Association office in Washington.

Mr. Flemer read to the Commission the following letter from the Virginia Nurserymen's Association Inc.

"The Honorable Douglas B. Fugate, Commissioner
Department of Highways
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Mr. Fugate:

The Virginia Nurserymen's Association protests the move by the Virginia Highway Department's Landscape Engineer to increase production of nursery stock at three state owned nursery locations. We are grateful for this opportunity to be here today to present our views. We point out to you our objections and reasons in the following order:

#1 On principle alone we protest any action by any tax supported branch of government to compete with private tax paying enterprise in the fields of basic production and manufacturing.

#2 Mr. Raymond Brush from the Washington, D. C, staff of the American Association of Nurserymen is here today to tell you that no other state highway department in the 50 United States grows any of its nursery stock. All is purchased on bid, contract, or private treaty basis with excellent results.

#3 The nursery industry, as other segments of our agricultural industry, has been and is plagued by surpluses in production. There are many reputable and responsible nurseries in our state and neighboring states who stand ready to supply plant material at fair and reasonable prices. A list of these suppliers can be made available by our association and tours can be arranged for the state landscape engineers to visit and inspect the facilities and stock available. It is certain that excellent buys can be arranged.

#4 We believe that nurserymen as experienced growers, can produce the nursery stock requirements of the highway department and deliver it to the site for permanent planting at a saving to Virginia taxpayers. Experience has taught us that knowledge of proper growing techniques is essential to the production of quality

11-18-65

plant material. It cannot be expected that prison laborers, or common laborers will prove to be knowledgeable or efficient in these skilled techniques. Further it should not be expected that the landscape engineer's time should be expended in producing the plants when basically he is employed to do the planning for the beautification of our highways.

#5 Nurserymen throughout the state have invested millions of dollars in land, special equipment, buildings, irrigation systems, greenhouses, etc, in order to economically produce plant material. Our industry, like most other modern industries, benefits from the use of expensive labor saving devices. Does the highway engineer plan to purchase specialized equipment for planting, cultivation, root pruning, digging, and loading, in order to produce as cheaply as nurserymen?

#6 It can be said that you can purchase a quantity of small plants, lining-out-stock, as nurserymen call them, plant them out, and in a few years they are worth many thousands of dollars. This sounds like an investors dream. Lets look at the true picture. It costs real money to produce and deliver a quality finished product to the site. Plants do not develop by themselves. To date no government agency, plant lover, gardener, or nurseryman has found a way to produce in volume a quality product without considerable expense. These following expenses must be accounted for regardless of who produces the plant; land, lining-out-stock, planting, trimming, irrigation, weed control, hoeing, cultivation, insecticides, disease control, staking, root pruning, digging, burlapping, losses, loading and delivery.

The results of a study of 39 wholesale nurserymen throughout the country by the Horticultural Research Institute, show that they average a profit on only 6% of gross sales. Unless the landscape engineer can show that his growing operation will be more efficient than the modern wholesale nursery grower, he can not save the taxpayer anything.

#7 This plan seems to us to be a diversion from the usual pattern of conservative Virginia government. Virginia citizens must be allowed freedom from governmental competition in basic production. This type of thing can easily grow into something bigger and usually does. For example, it was pointed out at our meeting with Mr. Fugate on November 4th. that the highway department had this fall actually been selling plants it had grown, to a landscape contractor.

11-18-65

We of the Virginia Nurserymen's Association recommend and urge defeat for this plan to increase production of nursery stock in state highway owned nurseries. We wish to make the following suggestions for the Landscape Engineering Department:

#1 That this department spend full time on highway beautification and planning, and none on collecting or growing plant material. We respectfully submit that the state should close the nurseries it is now operating and get completely out of the production business.

#2 We recommend that twice a year a survey be made for plant replacements. This list of needs should go out for bid prior to each planting season in order for bids to be let in time for delivery at the proper planting time in the fall (Oct. and Nov.) or spring (Mar. and April). Exact quantities may be purchased thereby allowing for no waste. Delivery schedules can be set for stops wherever plants are needed. All stock accepted to be selected and approved in the bidders nursery. In this way nothing but quality material used be planted by the highway department.

#3 We recommend that a list of varieties to be used by the department be supplied to our association. Nurserymen have no idea what varieties might be called for in landscape planning. A list need not be exact nor binding. It might be worded as follows: The Highway Department is planning to use in roadside landscaping the following varieties over a period of the next three to five years, Abelia grandiflora, Acer rubrum, Ilex opaca, Ilex glabra, Myrica cerifera, Rosa wichuriana, etc. Sizes might also be indicated. Quantities could be suggested. This need not be done if Virginia nurseries are already producing the varieties and quantities needed to supply the department.

Again we thank you for this opportunity to present our story. We stand ready to answer your questions, if any, and if we can. We urge you to defeat this move and ask for an early notification of your action.

Yours very truly,

Carl F. Flemer, Jr.
President - V. N. A.

Mr. Wynn brought out the fact that four Federal Government installations in the Norfolk area are not now growing nursery stock because of an executive order to discontinue the practice.

Mr. Brush stated that to the best of his knowledge, Virginia is the only State Highway Department that is attempting to grow their own plants. He stated the State of Michigan had

11-18-65

within the past six months changed from growing their own plantings to setting up contracts whereby they buy the plant material planted in place according to Highway Department plans and that this is the trend across the country.

Mr. Gilton asked whether the trend in Michigan was in reference to replacement or original plantings, or both. Mr. Brush said it applied to original plantings.

Mr. Landrith asked how much it would cost the Department to raise the 44,000 plants for which bids were asked.

Mr. Turner said he could not set a figure on this but that about a year ago an inventory had been taken of material in the Bristol District nursery and compared with wholesale prices, with the result that wholesale prices were found to be approximately four times what it had cost the Department.

Mr. Fugate stated the matter would be referred to the Commission Committee on Policy and since finance is so greatly involved he would ask the chairman of the Finance Committee to become, for this question only, a temporary member of the Policy Committee.

11-18-65

The following resolution was offered by Judge Weaver, and was unanimously adopted:

Our colleague, Mr. George L. Baughan, became a member of this Highway Commission in July, 1964, and since that time the entire membership of the Commission has learned to respect George Baughan for his abilities, to admire him for his high integrity and to appreciate his unconditional dedication to highway work. More than that, George Baughan, is one of the most generous and lovable of men.

And when it was learned with stunning suddenness on October 24, 1965, that his youngest son, Stuart Hayden Baughan, a student, had lost his life in an automobile accident in Charlottesville, our hearts went forth in fullest sympathy to our friend and his gracious lady, Mrs. Elizabeth Baughan. In their hour of pathos and sorrow, our emotions were stirred deeply, as we observed these wonderful people bearing up so bravely at such a difficult time.

In order that our sentiments and feelings may be properly recorded, we Resolve as members of the Highway Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia -

1. That we do extend to Mr. and Mrs. Baughan, their children, and the other members of their family, the heartfelt sympathies and condolences of this Commission at their grievous and irreparable loss.
2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. and Mrs. Baughan, and a copy spread on the minutes of this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.


Chairman

Attested:


Secretary